

REMARKS

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1-7, 9-18, and 20 are pending.

The specification has been amended as required by the Examiner on page 2, item 1 of the Office Action. The Applicants believe that these amendments fully address the objection to the drawings as set forth on page 2, item 2 of the Office Action. Therefore, no drawing corrections are being submitted with this paper.

Claims 1-3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Tso et al U.S. Patent No. 6,047,327 (Tso).

The present invention is directed primarily to a transport system by which a traveling vehicle can communicate with road side stations, each of which judges which road side station may offer a service. By this network, it is possible to avoid concentrating the processing load in a server as is known in the art.

Tso discloses a system that connects a plurality of servers through a network, including one server installed so as to execute processing for services. As noted above, the present invention avoids this concentration by providing plural processing units in a structure different from that

disclosed or fairly suggested by Tso. Further, Tso does not teach that location information is provided for comparison with the location of the road side stations, with a corresponding calculation of distance there between.

Claims 7-9, 11-18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hancock et al U.S. Patent No. 6,202,023 (Hancock).

Hancock teaches that a mobile body may have a device that generates location information for transmission with a request to a server having a database, through a base station. The server transmits a suitable response in accordance with the request. However, the present invention requires that each of the road side stations perform judgment as to whether the requested information should be transmitted to the mobile body, in contrast to Hancock's judgment at the mobile body device. Further, transmission in Hancock is periodic, whereas the invention transmits a response in response to a request, both to the mobile body and to the other road side stations. In other words, the request may be periodically transmitted, in contrast to Hancock. Hancock also fails to teach or fairly suggest the claimed location information and usage thereof to obtain a distance between the mobile body and the road side or base station.

Claims 4-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso in view of Hancock. As noted above, neither Tso nor Hancock discloses that the road side or base station executes the processing as claimed.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wecker et al U.S. Patent No. 6,311,058 (Wecker).

Wecker discloses that a single provider transmits packets to mobile devices. When a mobile device receives redundant packets due to a problem, the mobile device executes processing of one of the redundant packets. Note that only one provider transmits packets.

According to the present invention, on the other hand, a plurality of stations execute the same processing and transmit results of the processing to the mobile body, which utilizes the first response received and discards the rest.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hancock in view of Yoneyama et al U.S. Patent No. 5,187,810 (Yoneyama). Claim 19 has been canceled without prejudice, and without admission as to the propriety of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

for Gene W. Stanger RN 21021
Daniel J. Stanger
Registration No. 32,846
Attorney for Applicants

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 684-1120
Facsimile: (703) 684-1157
Date: April 6, 2004